

From: WadoDave@aol.com  
To: Mike Powell  
Date: 1/6/03 11:37AM  
Subject: WSJ article

I hope we are not going back to a monopoly system. I read this article and it looks to me like the RBOC'S get long distance plus your are giving them back their power.

I hope we don't see what is reported to happen or it will be clear that the FCC is not in favor of competition and the RBOC money has been well spend buying FCC votes.

This will be a sad day when companies are allowed to manipulate the system and keep a monopoly.

D Bills

96-98  
Original  
EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

RECEIVED

FEB - 7 2002

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 071  
List ABCDE

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

**From:** Philip Brendel  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** 1/6/03 2:25PM  
**Subject:** Rumors of the FCC allowing the "Baby Bells" free reign

To Commisioners of the FCC:

I have heard that the Baby Bells have a huge lobbying presence in Washington. If the baby bells have their way here again, it would be a classic case of politicians getting paid by a group of monopolies who see their cash cow getting bludgeoned by good old fashioned competition. The consumer would be crushed as there is no local competition without the Bells being forced to let competitive service providers into their network. It amazes me that the Baby Bells could pay policy makers enough money to enact idiotic and destructive policies. I really hope I am wrong and the Baby Bells are not allowed free reign. They are monopolies and overcharge all the time because there is no competition. I switched to MCI "The Neighborhood" and knocked my phone bill down dramatically. Why do you think wireless is cutting into their market share? It is because they overcharge all the time and wireless service providers can do it cheaper. The laws should not change simply because they suffer a little bit as soon as they are exposed to good old-fashioned competition.

Despite all the inroads made by cable and wireless, there is still really only one company that provides the reliable local line. This is comparable to one power line to the home. Each power provider doesn't have 10 lines to your home. The thought mentioned in the Journal today that telecom equipment providers would benefit from service providers building new local networks is idiotic. Overbuilding another local network is unproductive capital spending and should be avoided at all costs. The baby bells were lucky to inherit these lines from Ma Bell and should not be allowed to continue to rip off the US consumer any further.

I am outraged and need to let my thoughts be known to you. For those who may be curious, I am a conservative independent and voted for Bush in 2000 (Dole & Bush Sr in past elections) but feel Mr. Powell is way off here. This policy change would be so moronic that I am forced to believe someone must be getting compensated by the Baby Bells for following this course. This leads me to give credence to all the accusations of President Bush being too close to corporate America.

I truly hope these are rumors and we do not find that

this is the course taken. However, if it is, I hope the full fury of the public comes down on the FCC and discovers all the corrupt operations that must be taking place.

Sincerely,

Philip J. Brendel  
One 14th St, #506  
Hoboken, NJ 07030

---

Do you Yahoo!?  
Yahoo! Mail Plus - Powerful. Affordable. Sign up now.  
<http://mailplus.yahoo.com>

**From:** Michael Whalen  
**To:** Mike Powell  
**Date:** 1/6/03 10:20PM  
**Subject:** WSJ Article

Mr. Michael K. Powell  
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission

Dear Mr. Chairman,

According to today's front page article in The Wall Street Journal, you are an advocate of the "Baby Bells" proposal to free the local telephone service companies from the Federally mandated obligation to provide low-cost access to their local telephone networks to potential local telephone service competitors.

I am writing to lodge my strongest concern about the effect this will have on local telephone service competition.

I live in Montclair, New Jersey, where Verizon is the incumbent local telephone service company. I moved back to the U.S. recently and was horrified to find the costs associated with my local, local toll, and long-distance service from Verizon and a mainstream long-distance carrier. This was despite only moderate calling habits and an attempt to get attractive local and long-distance price packages. Meanwhile, Verizon has been relentlessly selling long-distance service, with little advantage to the consumer, other than bill integration.

Because of the existing regulations requiring network access, I was able to switch to MCI's The Neighborhood plan and I now enjoy a single consolidated bill with a single consolidated price for local, local-toll and long-distance telephone service. Yet, although a similar arrangement would result in significant savings for my neighbors, very few will switch ... such is the power of the incumbent carrier.

It is my firm opinion that local telephone service is by no means a level playing field and that the Government has let the Baby Bells enter long distance without any corresponding real competition in local telephone service. Nor would this change have any positive effect in inducing others to invest in the infrastructure to compete with the Baby Bells. The upfront costs would be tremendous at a time that no financing for such a venture could be raised. Even my cable company, which already has a "last mile investment" in my home has determined that competition on local telephone service is uneconomical and does not try to compete with Verizon.

Changing this regulation would be a complete retreat before the Baby Bells and will only reinforce the image of the Administration being in the pocket of well-funded business interests.

I strongly urge you to reconsider your position.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Whalen

**CC:** Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein

**From:** Raymond Gray  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** 1/8/03 12:14PM  
**Subject:** FCC may relax competition rules for local carriers

Dear FCC Commisioners

This will comment on the recent headlines regarding the possible relaxing of local loop resale requirements.

The proposal is, in my opinion, dead wrong. The resale requirement is the only reason I currently have access to an alternative dial-tone vendor (other than Voice over IP on cable, which is not yet technically competitive). My RBOC, Verizon, fought the NJ Board of Regulators for years over giving anyone access to the local loop; I am confident if you change the rules there will be a blood bath until no one else is offering dial-tone service in NJ.

A much better change would be to require RBOCs to move all local loop into an arm's length subsidiary, required to sell service at the same rate to all interested parties. This is happening now for electric and gas distribution and it would work just fine for dial-tone.

For what it's worth, I have just retired from 30 years in the Bell System and it's remaining piece parts (not an RBOC).

Sincerely

Raymond Gray  
New Jersey

**From:** Tim Taylor  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** 1/10/03 10:47PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Tim Taylor (president@telepricers.com) writes:

From: Timothy S. Taylor  
101 Pass Key Road  
Sarasota, FL 34242  
941-921-2337

RE: PRO CLEC Telecommunications Competition for Businesses is a must

I am extremely concerned with the news of your potentially supporting the LEC's (Bell South, Verizon, and Sprint) and the FCC Chairman Powell trying to undo part of the 1996 telecommunications act deregulating local phone service and to stop facilitating telecommunications competition for local phone service. In addition I do not agree that the federal government should be able to override the intrastate authority of the states to govern intrastate local phone service.

I have spent eight years developing a successful consulting firm facilitating telecommunications competition and providing employment to handicapped, minorities, and college interns within your district.

My employees and their families livelihood depend on CLEC's being able to compete with the LEC's in at least tier 1 and 2 business markets.

Frankly in my opinion Verizon (Florida) has deliberately tried to stifle competition. In my opinion as of this date Verizon (Florida) still has an unfair advantage of being able to bundle local, long distance, DSL/Data, and Wireless phone services on one bill. In addition they are still in the middle of converting from itself to a CLEC

Wireless and Cable competition is not enough when you consider the "bundling edge" potential of the LEC's. Competition of local phone service at all levels must be maintained to ensure both technological development and to create stimulus to the economic recovery by providing more jobs and keeping the existing ones.

Sincerely,  
Timothy S. Taylor, President  
Consultel, Inc.

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 68.57.25.72  
Remote IP address: 68.57.25.72

**From:** Bonnie Weiss  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** 1/11/03 2:03PM  
**Subject:** <No Subject>

Please vote NO to the proposed change to the 1996 Telco Act.

Bonnie Weiss



**From:** LPDLJGD37@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** 1/11/03 2:31PM  
**Subject:** the 1996 telco act!

Please as a matter of fairness vote no to changes on the 1996 telco act! Could you also look into the absurdity of it costing me more to call upper westchester county, than it would be for me to call California! the instate rates must go down & you should have hearings into that matter & take care of that matter right away! Thank you, for your time! Mr. Leonard P. Daniels 37 crisfield street Yonkers, NY 10710 telephone# 9149611320

**From:** Dozerbuster@aol.com  
**To:** Mike Powell, Kathleen Abernathy, Michael Copps, KM KJMWEB, Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** 1/13/03 8:22AM  
**Subject:** Telco Act

I urge you to vote no on rate changes to the 1996 Telco Act.

Robert A. Bell  
455 Fifth Street  
Brooklyn, NY 11215  
718-768-1273

**From:** Michelle K. Straub  
**To:** Commissioner Adelstein  
**Date:** 1/13/03 4:15PM  
**Subject:** Comments to the Commissioner

Michelle K. Straub (michelle@micro-comm.com) writes:

Commissioner Adelstein, I have deep concerns of the pending decisions awaiting the FCC. It appears that the Bell Companies have been reassembled and are earning record profits while telecom competition is dwindling. The thought of removing any network elements from use by competitors would kill competition and any chance of new investment by competitors. Prices for services would rise and every consumer would suffer.

Please support telecommunications competition.  
Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,

Michelle K. Straub

---

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 64.213.147.250  
Remote IP address: 64.213.147.250